

that we will properly protect all classified information submitted in response to this request.

(I) Documents in the custody of the Secretary of State:

(A) The Aide Memoire dated June 30, 1995, signed by Vice President Al Gore and Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, along with all annexes thereto that have at any time been in effect (including any amendments to such annexes).

(B) The letter dated December 9, 1996, from Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin to Vice President Al Gore, any correspondence from the U.S. Government to which that letter was responding, and any U.S. Government response to that letter.

(C) The letter dated January 13, 2000, from Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov, transmitted by the Department of State on January 13, 2000, in a telegram designated "State 008180".

(D) The letter dated December 17, 1999, from Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

(E) The Department of State telegrams designated "State 243445", "State 244826", "Moscow 32441", and "Moscow 362", referred to in the Department of State telegram designated "State 008180" of January 13, 2000.

(2) Documents in the custody of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the director of Central Intelligence, or any agency or establishment within the Intelligence Community:

(A) All documents that contain, refer, reflect, or relate in any way to transfers or possible transfers of goods or technology from Russia to Iran in violation or potential violation of commitments contained in the Aide Memoire dated June 30, 1995, signed by Vice President Al Gore and Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, or the letter dated December 9, 1995, from Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin to Vice President Al Gore.

(B) All documents that contain, refer, reflect, or relate in any way to possible revisions to the understanding set forth in the Aide Memoire dated June 30, 1995, signed by Vice President Al Gore and Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, and the annexes thereto.

(C) All documents that contain, refer, reflect, or relate in any way to possible application of the Case-Zablocki Act (1 U.S.C. 112b) to the Aide Memoire dated June 30, 1995, signed by Vice President Al Gore and Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, or the letter dated December 9, 1995, from Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin to Vice President Al Gore.

(D) All documents that contain, refer, reflect, or relate in any way to consideration of whether goods or technology transferred from Russia to Iran contributed to efforts by Iran to acquire destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons.

(E) All documents that contain, refer, reflect, or relate in any way to consideration of whether weapons transferred from Russia to Iran destabilized the military balance in the Persian Gulf region, or enhanced Iran's offensive capabilities in destabilizing ways.

(F) All documents that contain, refer, reflect, or relate in any way to other secret understandings or agreements, or secret provisions of understandings or agreements, reached by the Clinton Administration with Russia regarding transfers to Iran or any other country of weapons-related goods, services, or technology.

(3) Documents in the custody of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(A) All documents that contain, refer, reflect, or relate in any way to the rationale or

justification for purchase from the Russian Aviation and space Agency of the items referred to in the letters dated February 11, 2000 and February 15, 2000, from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to Chairman F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., of the Committee on Science (exclusive of those items that, as of the date of the adoption of this resolution, already have been acquired from the Russian Aviation and Space Agency).

(B) All documents that contain, refer, reflect, or relate in any way to utilization of the exception for crew safety contained in section 6(f) of the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-178), or interpretation of the term "necessary to prevent the imminent loss of life by or grievous injury to individuals aboard the International Space Station" as contained in that section.

We appreciate your prompt attention to this request.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
*Chairman, Committee
on International Relations.*

PORTER J. GOSS,
*Chairman, Permanent
Select Committee on
Intelligence.*

FLOYD SPENCE,
*Chairman, Committee
on Armed Services.*

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

□

TIPPING THE BALANCE: GEORGE W. BUSH AND THE SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, when women and Americans go to the polls on Tuesday, I believe there will be two words more important and more at stake than any other. These two words are not "Democrat" and "Republican," they are not "House" and "Senate," and they are not even "Gore" and "Bush."

The two words that this election comes down to are "Supreme Court." The next President of the United States will appoint at least two or three, maybe even more, Supreme Court Justices. He will define our constitutional rights not for the next 4 years, but for the next 40.

If G.W. Bush is elected and the balance of the court tips right, which it will, far right, the consequences are clear: civil rights, privacy rights, and reproductive rights will be in jeopardy. Our environmental protections, affirm-

ative action, and the separation of church and State will all be on the line, because the fact is these two words, "Supreme Court," can come down to just one vote.

Right now, one single vote protects a woman's right to choose and recognizes her fundamental control over her own body. Both Planned Parenthood versus Casey and Stenberg versus Carhart demonstrated that a woman's right to choose is fragile. It hangs by the slimmest of margins five to four.

Without the protection of *Roe v. Wade*, Congress and many State legislators have proven that they are willing to pass laws restricting abortion procedures, even when a woman's health is at stake. Yet, to overturn *Roe*, to put a woman's health and her very life at risk, G.W. Bush would not need to use three appointments or even two. It would just take one.

He says he trusts the people and not the government to make their own decisions. He must not be talking about women. One vote. There are those who say there is no way to predict. They say Justices are independent; that Reagan appointed Sandra Day O'Connor, who is pro-choice; that the would-be impact of G.W. Bush on the bench is exaggerated.

But I think that the best way to measure someone is through not what they say but what they do. When asked what kind of Justices he would appoint to the bench, Governor Bush said very clearly, strict constructionists, like Scalia and Thomas, the far right of the current court. Governor Bush is not just looking to tip the balance to the right, he wants to knock the scales over.

If Members doubt that Scalia, Thomas, and Bush would wipe out many of the protections Americans hold dear and undermine decades of Supreme Court decisions, just look at the Scalia and Thomas dissents.

Scalia, Thomas, and Bush would exempt elections for State judges from all provisions of the Voting Rights Act.

Scalia, Thomas, and Bush would permit sex discrimination in jury selection.

Scalia, Thomas, and Bush would eliminate affirmative action.

Scalia, Thomas, and Bush would restrict remedies for discrimination, while at the same time making it harder to prove discrimination.

And who would join Scalia, Thomas, and Bush? Let us look at the possible short list: J. Michael Luttig of the Fourth Circuit. He wrote the opinion that prevents women from suing their attacker in Federal court under the Violence Against Women Act.

Judge Luttig, along with another potential Bush pick, Fourth Circuit Chief Justice J. Harvie Wilkinson, led the charge to overturn the *Miranda* decision that says, you should know your rights if you are arrested.

Judge Emilio Garza said *Roe v. Wade* may not be constitutional law.

Justice Samuel Alito is so conservative that he is now referred to as

"Scalito," and Judge Edith Jones, a severe critic of death penalty appeals. She overruled a decision that a Texas death row inmate deserved a new hearing, even though his lawyer literally slept through part of the trial.

□ 1845

These judges are not the extreme on Bush's list. They are the list. They are not the exceptions to the rule, they make the rules, and we will have to abide by them.

If you believe in women's rights, AL GORE should shape the court. If you believe that minorities should be counted and respected; if you believe everyone is innocent until proven guilty; and if you believe, like I do, that justice should be blind and not asleep, AL GORE should shape the court.

AL GORE, not Scalia, Thomas and Bush, should protect our rights for the next generation.

When we vote, we will elect a President for 4 years. Supreme Court appointments last a lifetime. Two words, Supreme Court; one vote, one choice, AL GORE.

□

THE HORRIBLE DEBT OUR NATION FACES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), my colleague, for joining me tonight.

Madam Speaker, I have come to talk about what I consider to be one of the greatest threats to our Nation, and that is the horrible debt that our Nation faces and the absolute reluctance on the part of both Presidential candidates and almost everyone who seeks higher public office to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, when I go down the street in my home State of Mississippi and folks ask me where do their tax dollars go, they are almost dumbfounded when I tell them that the largest expenditure of their Nation is interest on our Nation's debt.

Yesterday our Nation spent \$1 billion on interest on the national debt. We did the same thing today. We did it 3 days ago. We did it 5 days ago. We have done it every day for the past year. Unless we change the way we are doing business here in our Nation's capitol, we will spend at least a billion dollars on the national debt tomorrow, the next day, and every day for the rest of our lives.

What do we get for that? It does not educate one child. It does not build one inch of highways. It does not build one war ship to defend our Nation. It does not pay the kids in uniform. It is squandered down a rat hole and most appropriately, and something most Americans would find very disturbing, is about one third of the interest on our Nation's debt is fully paid to for-

eign lending institutions. See German and Japanese lending institutions actually control the papers on about one third of our Nation's debit.

For my father and your fathers, those who fought the great World War II to save us from the tyranny of then Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan, you have to imagine how upset they would be to realize that the nations they saved us from now control America's financial future because they control our debt.

Madam Speaker, I often wonder how this incredible misperception of a big budget surplus could come from, because we hear it every day. I hear otherwise educated people talk as if they are mindless idiots. So when they talk about an alleged surplus, I really wonder again where it comes from.

I think I know one of the places that it came from. This was an ad that was run in several national publications, including the USA Today. It was run December 6 of 1995, and it features then head of the Republican National Committee, a face that most of you would remember, a guy named Haley Barbour from the State of Mississippi.

It is a full-page ad. He is holding a million dollar check, and it says up top, heard the one about the Republicans getting Medicare? It says down here the fact is that the Republicans are increasing Medicare spending by more than half. I am Haley Barbour. I am so sure of this fact that I am willing to give you this check for a million dollars if you can prove me wrong.

He goes on down here to have the actual terms of that challenge. Here is why you have no chance for a million dollars. The Republican National Committee will present a cashier's check for \$1 million to the first American who can prove the following statement is false, in quotations, in November of 1995, the U.S. House and Senate passed a balanced budget bill. It increases total Federal spending on Medicare by more than 50 percent from 1995 to the year 2002 pursuant to congressional budget standards.

Madam Speaker, what was called to his attention in a hand-delivered letter just a few days later is that the bill that they passed for that year to run the Nation was not a balanced budget bill.

For you at home, for me, for our Nation, for my State, a balanced budget is when you spend no more than you collect, where you are collecting your salary and what you spend or what this Nation or my State collects in taxes and what they spend. If you spend more than you are collecting, then it is not a balanced budget, that is a deficit budget.

Remember this change was made on a budget that passed in November of 1995, so that would have been the budget for the fiscal year 1996, running from October 1 1995 through September of 1996. As we can see, and this is for those of you who have your computers at home, the source for this is the

United States Government annual reports for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999, all taken from the monthly Treasury statements for the month of September for those years.

What you can see is for the fiscal year 1996, the first year that the challenge would have been in effect, the Republican Congress passed a budget that was \$221 billion, \$960 million in deficit. That is almost a billion a day that they were spending more than they were collecting in taxes, so maybe they did not get to the balanced budget quite as quick as they thought they could.

For fiscal year 1997, Federal funds were \$145,217,000 in deficit. As you can see, these are the trust funds, things like the Social Security trust fund, but for the Federal trust funds, the real portion that we determine, there was no balanced budget. Fiscal year 1998, \$88,088,000 in deficit. Fiscal year 1999, \$82,998,000 in deficit.

All of these years later, the Nation finally turned a surplus in September of the year 2000. It was not easily accomplished. I came to the House floor in the month of July to point out that through the end of June, our Nation was running an \$11 billion annual operating deficit. Again, these are from the monthly Treasury statements, Department of Treasury, table 8, page 30.

What you do not see is what you do not hear is when they talk about a big surplus, they are not telling you that that surplus is in the Social Security trust fund, the military retiree trust fund, the Medicare trust fund, the highway trust fund. The key word in each of these sentences is the word trust.

These are taxes that are collected from a specific group of people and set aside by people who trust our Nation to spend them on nothing but that one purpose. When my young daughter teaches sailing lessons during the summer and she pays Social Security on that paycheck, she trusts that money will be set aside so that years from now when she is a senior citizen that money will be available for her Social Security.

When you go to the gas pump and pay gasoline taxes, you trust that that money will be set aside to build roads.

When a military person serving our Nation in places like Korea, places like Bosnia, Kosovo pays into his trust fund, he trusts that that money will be set aside for when he retires so that his retirement check is sent every month.

When someone pays into the Medicare trust fund, all of us are counting on that money being set aside so that when we need those services, that money will be there.

The only surpluses that are out there are in the trust funds. So to say that I am going to have a big tax break or we are going to spend a whole lot more money because of these big surpluses, my question to those people are, who are you going to steal it from? Are you going to take it from people's Social